

REMARKS

In response to the Final Office Action dated June 16, 2008, Applicant respectfully submits the following arguments.

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 4, 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,961,857 to Floryanzia (Floryanzia).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "configuring a Media Gateway (MG) with an authentication key and setting a security data package on a network protocol, by a Media Gateway Controller (MGC); during a security authentication, sending, by the MGC, security authentication request data to the MG using the data package; receiving by the MGC a calculation result obtained by performing an encryption calculation on the request data using the authentication key by the MG; and determining by the MGC whether the MG is legal according to the calculation result."

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 differs from Floryanzia in the following aspects:

(1) Claim 1 authenticates the gatekeeper (MGC) to the gateway (MG). The Examiner erroneously aligns the gateway of Floryanzia with the gatekeeper (or MGC) of claim 1 and aligns the Gatekeeper of Floryanzia with the gateway (MG) of claim 1. In contrast, Floryanzia discloses authenticating the *Gateway* to the *Gatekeeper*. (Floryanzia column 3, line 56-58.) Floryanzia fails to disclose at least "determining by the *MGC* whether the *MG* is legal according to the calculation result."

The claimed invention may be visualized as follows.

MGC

MG

Calculate result A

-----configure-----→

-----security auth request----→

←-----result B-----

Compare A&B,

If A equal B then

the gateway is legal

By contrast, Figs. 3A-3C in Floryanzia show the registration request (RRQ) 306 being sent from the gateway to the gatekeeper and an authentication server comparing results 324, not the gatekeeper (MGC), as claimed.

(2) Floryanzia does not disclose the technical feature “setting a security data package on a network protocol” of claim 1.

(3) Furthermore, based on the above discussion, Applicant respectfully submitted that it is inappropriate to align the gateway of Floryanzia with the MGC of claim 1 and to align the Gatekeeper of Floryanzia with the MG of claim 1. Even if it were necessary to align the corresponding entities, it would be appropriate for those skilled in the art that the gateway of Floryanzia should be aligned with the Media Gateway (MG) of claim 1 and the Gatekeeper of Floryanzia should be aligned with the Media Gateway Controller (MGC) of claim 1. In this case, none of the technical features “configuring a Media Gateway (MG) with an authentication key and setting a security data package on a network protocol, by a Media Gateway Controller (MGC); during a security authentication, sending, by the MGC, security authentication request data to the MG using the data package; receiving by the MGC a calculation result obtained by performing an encryption calculation on the request data using the authentication key by the MG” of claim 1 are disclosed by Floryanzia.

As discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Floryanzia. Claims 2-6 depend, directly or indirectly, from allowable claim 1 and thus include the allowable subject matter of claim 1 while adding or further defining elements. Therefore claims 2-6 are also not anticipated by Floryanzia.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Floryanzia in view of U.S. Publication No. 20020120760 to Kimchi et al. (Kimchi).

Kimchi fails to cure the deficiencies of Floryanzia that is discussed above with respect to claim 1. Dependent claims 2 and 3 include the technical features of claim 1 and, as such, are patentable over the combination of Floryanzia and Kimchi.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: September 16, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By _____/Robert Kinberg/
Robert Kinberg
Registration No.: 26,924
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, DC 20043-9998
(202) 344-4000
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant